



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/745,863	12/21/2000	Howard Shelton Lambert	GB999141US1	2220
46369	7590	06/22/2006	EXAMINER	
HESLIN ROTHENBERG FARLEY & MESITI P.C.			SIMITOSKI, MICHAEL J	
5 COLUMBIA CIRCLE			ART UNIT	
ALBANY, NY 12203			PAPER NUMBER	

2134

DATE MAILED: 06/22/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

09/745,863

Applicant(s)

LAMBERT ET AL.

Examiner

Michael J. Simitoski

Art Unit

2134

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 06 June 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: _____.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant's response (p. 2) argues that the DRM system of Peinado is not a decoding controller. However, the purpose of Peinado's DRM system is to decode data that is protected. Applicant argues that Peinado comprises no decoding controller that sends a request for access to encoded data stored in the same data processing apparatus in which the decoding controller sits. However, as previously stated, Peinado's computing device stores encoded data (Fig. 1, col. 2, lines 53-62), which comprises a decoding controller/black box which sends a request to a license server (col. 18, lines 26-53). The encoded data is located in the same processing system in which the decoding controller/black box sits, although this limitation is not presented in claim 1.

Applicant's response (p. 3) argues that Peinado does not provide access to protected content in response to a request, as claimed in claim 1. However, in Peinado, a user makes a request to access content stored on his/her computing device (Fig. 1, col. 2, lines 53-62), after which the device sends a request for attributes and upon receiving these attributes, decodes the content and provides it to the user (col. 23, lines 46-55).

Applicant's response (p. 4) argues that the checking of the black box version number in Peinado is "quite different" from checking whether it is there at all. However, the claim recites checking whether program code exists on the storage device. Peinado checks for the most current program code or program code meeting a threshold relating to the program code's age.

Applicant's response (p. 4) argues regarding claim 15 that a license is not an attribute of a decoding process. However, as a license relates to the decoding process, it falls within the scope of the claim.

Applicant (p. 5) argues regarding claim 16 that the attributes change for a subsequent requestor session and the cited portion of Peinado "merely teaches re-issuing of a license". Applicant makes the assertion that this is different. However, MPEP §716.01(c) states that arguments of counsel cannot take the place of evidence in the record. The mere allegation that this is different without citation of specific claim language and evidence of how the cited portion of Peinado does not fall within the scope of the claim is not persuasive.

Applicant's response (p. 2) argues that "an unspecified 'client/personal computer' is not a decoding controller". However, the decoding controller in Marvit, however, exists on the user's personal computer, from where the request originates and therefore falls within the scope of the claim language.

Regarding applicant response in general, applicant is reminded that in the examination of a patent application, the meanings of claim terms are given their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of Applicant's specification. See *In re Hyatt*, 211 F.3d 1367, 1372, 54 USPQ2d 1664, 1667 (Fed. Cir. 2000), *Phillips v. AWH Corp.*, 415 F.3d 1303, 1312-17 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc). Further, although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).



Jacques H. Louis-Jacques
JACQUES H. LOUIS-JACQUES
PRIMARY EXAMINER